EXHIBIT

E

Part 5

. 21

in this discussion, although the papers speak to it, is the Quran Foundation.

MR. HAEFELE: I can speak to that briefly, your Honor.

The Quran Foundation is basically Mr. Seda. Mr. Seda set it

up. Mr. Seda pretty much did the same thing.

The Al Haramain entity basically came on the scene to supplement and to enlarge the size, enlarge the scope of, to enlarge the financial capabilities of what the Quran Foundation is doing. The Quran Foundation was Mr. Seda. Everything that he did under the Quran Foundation he eventually did that and more under Al Haramain's name. They had the same office, they were run by the same guy, they had the same staff, they shared offices, phone numbers, computer networks. Everything that was the Quran Foundation was what Mr. Seda was doing with Al Haramain. There is really no distinction.

THE COURT: But for purposes of the present motion, what is the relief you want? Is it a ruling that the two Al Haramain foundations should be viewed as a single entity? Well, clearly it's that, that they should be viewed as a single entity such that the Saudi Arabian entity should be producing documents or should have preserved documents at an earlier time. But beyond that what is it you are seeking presently?

MR. HAEFELE: You know, our position is since they are alter egos, to the extent we have requested information from Al Haramain the U.S. branch, that requires them to produce

.3

anything that the U.S. branch or that can be gotten related to the greater Al Haramain knowledge of what was going on in Al Haramain worldwide.

As to the Quran Foundation, since it really is the same, and since they shared information, and since a number of the documents that have been produced indicate that there was really little distinction between things going on at the Quran Foundation, things going on at the Al Haramain foundation the U.S. branch, there is a problem that there may be substantial documents in Mr. Seda's possession that relate to work that was done for either or. And since that distinction is dissolved for the most part, we want to see the documents from the Quran Foundation that relate to Al Haramain, and I think that's the way the request was made.

THE COURT: Is Mr. Seda a defendant in the suit?

MR. HAEFELE: Yes, he is. I believe the discovery is open to him as well. I think his motion to dismiss was also denied.

THE COURT: OK. Well, I guess one question would be has he been subpoensed -- not subpoensed -- has he been given a request for production of documents?

MR. HAEFELE: He has not, because we understood that the request to the Al Haramain Foundation was sufficient. And he was the U.S. officer. I mean we could do it, but it would be redundant.

0287TERC '

THE COURT: Well, it might be, but it might not be.

Who represents him, by the way, do you know?

MR. HAEFELE: The same lawyers, your Honor, Mr. Kabat's office.

MR. KABAT: Yes.

THE COURT: I'll ask him the question: If he were served with a request for production of documents individually, would it yield any more documents?

MR. KABAT: I don't think so, your Honor, because what happened is that when Mr. Seda was overseas, the government, you know, seized all the documents that were in the Ashland office, and then they turned them over to his defense attorney in Portland. He is represented by the public defender. They in turn gave us a copy, and we produced those to the plaintiffs. So, that seems to be the totality of what was in the Ashland office.

THE COURT: There was also a discussion in the various papers I received about the extent to which various requests or, more particularly, interrogatories were overbroad or the objections to those interrogatories were boilerplate. Should we discuss that today, or is it more appropriate for me to first decide the issue we have been talking about thus far and then see where that take us?

MR. HAEFELE: Your Honor, I would go whichever way your Honor would prefer.

MR. KABAT: Your Honor, I would agree you should decide the first issue. And I would also note that the plaintiffs' reply brief, the January 5 brief, did not address any of our response on the overbroad and so forth issues, so they're fully submitted on the papers.

THE COURT: OK. Well, then I will focus first on the issue of whether the -- well, I guess it's one and a half issues -- whether the Saudi entity and the U.S. entity should be viewed as one in the same, and if the Saudi entity comes into the loop, whether that implicates all of the worldwide activities of the Foundation, since I gather there were what Mr. Haefele would call and I guess at times what the Foundation called branch offices in other countries.

MR. HAEFELE: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HAEFELE: Two points that I would like to make to your Honor, fairly simplistic I hope.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. HAEFELE: We didn't respond to the additional issue related to the scope or the burden or the breadth of the discovery requests in our later letter because we thought we did cover it substantially in our December 2 letter on pages 14 and 15. But the other issue is if you look at our December 2 letter, on the bottom of page 15 there is a really important typo that I would like to correct for your Honor.

.4

THE COURT: Is that the one where you left out the word "not"?

MR. HAEFELE: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: I caught that. I read it twice because it did seem to be a change in your position.

MR. HAEFELE: I read it a lot over the weekend and tried to figure out where that word "not" was.

THE COURT: I had already taken the liberty of correcting that in my copy.

MR. HAEFELE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. As to this issue I'm going to reserve decision.

The next conference before Judge Daniels is scheduled for April 15. I haven't a clue whether he will hold that conference or not, but I wanted to alert everyone and let whoever is not here who needs to know know that I have asked him if it is held on April 15 to move it to the afternoon because I have a conflict in the morning. So if it occurs, and assuming it occurs on April 15, it's likely to be the afternoon, not the morning.

Anything else anybody wants to bring up today?

MR. CARNER: A minor thing we mentioned earlier. As I mentioned, we are in this difficult situation where discovery is ongoing as to Al Haramain in one case but its motion remains pending in the rest of the cases. And we very much would like

to try to harmonize the situation. So, to the extent that we're going to make an application, would you prefer that go to you or to Judge Daniels?

THE COURT: No, I think that one should -- basically to say that everybody ought to be involved in whatever discovery is permitted as to Al Haramain U.S. and/or Saudi Arabia?

MR. CARNER: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, I think that should come to me.

MR. CARNER: OK. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you, all.

MR. HAEFELE: Thank you, your Honor.